

## **REMARKS**

### **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Therefore, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-16, and 18-20 were pending. After the instant amendments, claims 6, 8-10, 16, and 18-20 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112**

In the office action, claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs, for reasons relating to the recited “converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping between the second alphabet and the third alphabet.” In order to clarify this feature, applicants have amended claims 6 and 16 to recite that the received text string is converted initially to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediate language from which it is then converted to a third alphabet of a second language based on a (second) predefined phonetic map between the second alphabet and the third alphabet. This feature is described in the specification, for example, in figure 10 and paragraph [46] in sufficient detail so that one skilled in the art would be enabled to make and use the recited feature. Furthermore, the scope of this feature is also very clear to one skilled in the art in view of the disclosure of the application. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that this claim is both enabled and in definite form and meets the requirements of section 112.

### **PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

In the office action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,460,015 (hereafter “Hetherington”) in view of the article “An Interactive Translation Support facility for non-Professional Users” ANLP 1997 (hereafter “Yamabana”). While applicants do not necessarily agree

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/777,154  
Attorney Docket Number: 306213.01  
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

with this rejection, it is now moot since applicants have cancelled these claims in order to expedite prosecution of this case.

Claims 6, 7-10 (presumably 8-10), 16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hetherington in view of US Patent No. 5,432,948 (hereafter “Davis”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*,

receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device;

**converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme** between the first alphabet and the second alphabet;

**converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme** between the second alphabet and the third alphabet...

None of the applied references disclose the features recited above. Specifically, the recited features require (1) receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device, (2) **converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme, and** (3) **converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme** between the second alphabet and the third alphabet. Neither features (2) or (3), nor their relationship is disclosed by any of the applied references.

In sharp contrast to these recited features, Hetherington only discloses transliteration between input received in a first alphabet to a phonetic string in a second alphabet. The cited portions of Hetherington in the office action disclose “mapping text strings from one character set to another. Still more particularly, the present invention relates to ... saving a text string entered in one character set together with a sound-

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/777,154  
Attorney Docket Number: 306213.01  
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

mapped representation of the same text string in another character set.” See col. 1, lines 47-54 of Hetherington. Col. 2, lines 50-55 discloses exactly the same sound-mapping of a text string entered in one character set together with the same text string sound-mapped to characters in another character set.

The entire disclosure of Hetherington is directed to this one way sound mapping between text entered in one character set to another character set. See, for example, col. 7, lines 27-37 of Hetherington which discloses that “an internal method within the transliteration engine 220 is employed to sound-map the passed string to a phonetic, latin character representation for alt string 208 to transliterate entered characters into other characters....” Accordingly, Hetherington does not disclose or suggest the claimed transliteration sequence using first and second predefined mapping schemes using a second alphabet of an intermediate language as recited in pending independent claim 6.

Neither is this deficiency of Hetherington cured by any of the other applied references which have been applied to other recited features in the office action.

Specifically, Davis discloses a rule based text input transliteration system in which transliterators are desktop objects that have to be activated by a user for transliteration between a first language character string and a second language character string. See Abstract of Davis. Yamabani teaches the use of hooking for *translation* and as such it does not relate to transliteration in any way. Therefore, these references also do not cure the deficiencies of Hetherington that are discussed earlier herein. Accordingly, pending independent claim 6 is patentable over Hetherington.

Pending independent claim 16 recites features that are very similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is also patentable for similar reasons. Specifically, independent claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, (1) receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device, (2) converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/777,154  
Attorney Docket Number: 306213.01  
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

alphabet, *and* (3) converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet... As discussed in the context of claim 6, this combination of features is not disclosed by any of the applied references or their reasonable combination. Accordingly, pending independent claim 16 is also patentable over the applied references.

### **DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a whole.

It should be noted that applicants have not separately argued the patentability of each of the dependent claims in view of the patentability of the independent claim from which they ultimately depend. However, applicants reserve the right to distinguish these claims over the presently applied reference and do not acquiesce in the currently applied rejections in view of the clear deficiencies of the applied reference with respect to the pending independent claims as discussed earlier herein.

### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/777,154  
Attorney Docket Number: 306213.01  
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

*If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 19, 2008

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/

Aaron C. Chatterjee  
Reg. No. 41,398  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (425) 706-7453  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 19, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/777,154  
Attorney Docket Number: 306213.01  
Filing Date: February 13, 2004